



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

military talents"! Thank God for the Alexanders, and Genghis-Khan, and Attilas, and Napoleons, those ravagers of continents, and wholesale butchers of mankind! As well thank God for the devil and his allies in sin and mischief.—Military talents in heaven! Saints and angels going to fight there, and turn it into a battle-field, a central Aceldama for the universe? Where will the revolting absurdities of war-logic end?

MURDER AS A FANATICISM.

There is said to be in Russia a sect who believe in assassination as a religious duty or merit, an offering agreeable to God. They have committed so many murders that the government has been forced in defence of society to take measures for their suppression.

This strange delusion is by no means new. On the conquest of India the British found there a religious sect whose peculiar mission or vocation was to commit murder. They secured their livelihood by assassination. It was a matter of both religion and business. One of the sacred Hindoo books is devoted to the sect, and with minute accuracy describes their creed and their practice. We can hardly credit or conceive the existence of such a sect; but the main facts are well authenticated. It is said that they murdered not from malice, nor for the sake of plunder, but *from religious motives*. A religion of blood; men killed without malice, solely to please the great Father of all!

We know only one match to this strange and horrid delusion—the *custom of war*. Is not the war-system, now kept up in every Christian land, a fair and pretty full counterpart to this thuggism? There are millions of men in Christendom, supported at an expense of hundreds and thousands of millions of money, whose profession and whole business it is to kill men, not on their own account or pleasure, but at the arbitrary bidding of their rulers. They protest, like Hindoo thugs, that they commit the crimes of war, its wholesale robberies and murders, from no malice or selfish motives, but as a matter of duty in obedience to their rulers! They say they have no responsibility in the case they just do the deeds of violence, blood and vengeance which they are commanded to do.

Such is the *Thuggism of War*. And is it not akin to the bloody, remorseless fanaticism of Russia and Hindoostan? What valid warrant can there be for either system in Christianity, reason or common sense? Yet this system of blood, inherited from pagan barbarism, is still continued under our religion of peace, with little disposition anywhere to call in question either its necessity or its propriety!

LOOSE LOGIC.—“When the Cubans are sufficiently consolidated to be recognized as an armed force, representing organized military and civil power, and holding possession of a province, or some leading city, then the force of public opinion in the United States will demand recognition.”

So says a Boston journal that claims a very wide circulation and great influence. But in such talk is there any principle, reason or common sense? The Cuban rebels are trampling under foot all the laws of the government over

them, wholesale violators of law; and can it be right for our government, or any other, to abet or in any way aid them in committing such crimes?

We know well the excuse — *they are revolutionists*. True; but can this plea alter the question of right, or prove that they are *not* committing such crimes? Does any government permit or excuse such crimes? Can it and live? It is conceded on all hands that such deeds of violence and blood as the Cuban rebels are now perpetrating, would be inexcusably wrong unless they have “an armed force, and possession of a province or some leading city.” What a criterion of right! Can ability to commit crime with success or impunity, make such crimes right and praiseworthy? If a large number of men raise an army, get possession of one or more considerable cities, and thus acquire power to commit robbery, murder and all manner of crimes on a gigantic scale, should we think all this would make it right for our government, or any other, to recognize them as rightful belligerents and an independent nation? True, England and France conceded belligerency to our rebels; but did we think then, or do we now, that they were right? Did not England burn her own fingers by so doing? May not we burn ours by meddling with the Cuban imbroglio? Alas! how little conscience, consistency or common sense in the intercourse of nations.

BISHOP WILBERFORCE ON WAR.—“I can hardly conceive,” he says, in a recent sermon before a Missionary Society, “a more miserable circumstance for the whole civilized world, and for the whole Christian Church, than that through the evil passions of men these two great countries (England and the United States) should be driven into war. We ought to be at peace; our interests are one; we are both the great witnesses for liberty; we are both the great witnesses for national freedom. If we should be diverted from advancing these blessings throughout the world by a mutual hostility one to the other, it would be one of those deep judgments of which we read in the blackest pages of past history as having been allowed to overshadow humanity; and yet we see how one single utterance of one man, whose temper is not under perfect control, has been permitted to electrify a great continent and endanger the peaceful relations of two mighty empires.”

PEACE SENTIMENT IN FRANCE.—It is only germinating there among the people after ages of an intense war-mania. “It is incontestably true,” as Frederic Passy says, “that the influence of our ideas has increased considerably within some months. Within a week even, on the occasion of the election of our representatives, one could see, without exaggeration, that the cry, *down with war*, had considerable influence. Every one of the candidates declared energetically in favor of Peace, the reduction of the army, and the diminution of the Budget of War. This is the best proof of the popularity of these ideas. We have not the presumption to attribute the honor of this change to our efforts entirely; but we should do injustice to ourselves, and the friends of the cause, if we did not say that our efforts had contributed towards this end. This result was not so much from the real sentiments of the candidates as it was the progress of public opinion.”